

Atty. Docket No. BRU06 P-408A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit : 3636
Examiner : Gerald A. Anderson
Applicants : Troy A. Recknagel et al.
Appln. No. : 09/854,210
Filing Date : May 11, 2001
Confirmation No. : 8375
For : TABLE-MOUNTED BOWLING SCORING UNIT

FAX RECEIVED

APR 23 2002

GROUP 3600

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

In response to the Office Action mailed March 25, 2002, Applicants request that the Examiner consider following remarks.

REMARKS

The present Office Action alleged that Applicant's election of Fig. 10 and claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18 and 20 was not properly responsive with the restriction requirement of the previous Office Action in that none of the elected independent claims read on the elected Fig. 10. According to the Office Action, each independent claim requires a recess and in the disclosure the only recess is found when referring to Fig. 9. The Office Action further stated that the scoring unit of Fig. 10 is defined in the disclosure as supported on the pedestal and not as attached to the table.

Contrary to the Office Action assertion, Applicants submit that the Reply filed November 2, 2001, was fully responsive to the Office Action mailed October 23, 2001. With reference to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 2111 states that "[d]uring patent examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicants note that claim 1 (as well as claims 8 and 15) includes a